

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. The Final Rejection mailed on March 2 2007, rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant amends claims 1-2, 11, and 13-21. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in Fig. 7. No new matter has been added.

**I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Final Rejection rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Office Action alleges that the terms "real space," "real place," and "non-simulated" constitute new matter. Applicant hereby traverses the rejection.

As noted on, for example, page 9, line 6, of the specification as filed, an activity event of each object in a common work space in an actual world is detected. Likewise, references to the word "actual" occur throughout the specification, for example, at page 11, line 13, and so on. It is clear from these references that "non-simulated," "real space," and "real place," are not new matter and refer to actual non-simulated environments.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-21 do not contain new matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are earnestly solicited.

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Final Rejection rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Toomey in view of Hamada. The Office Action asserts that Toomey teaches each feature of instant claims 1-21 except for "presentation information apparatus of an object that includes live video image and sound of a detected user event activity," which is allegedly taught by Hamada. It would, thus, allegedly have been obvious to an ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify Toomey in view of Hamada in order to "enhance presentation software." Moreover, the Advisory Action mailed June 8, 2007 asserts that Hamada discloses a system, product and a method for processing and presenting a plurality of multimedia data

objects in the actual world, interactively, such as text, graphics, images and sound, and includes multiple input devices such as a VTR, video camera, and an audiotape. Applicant amends claims 1-2, 11 and 13-21 and respectfully traverses the rejection.

Each of instant amended independent claims 1-2, 11 and 13-21 recites "wherein the objects in the work space include a person in the at least one non-simulated real space." Thus, as is described throughout the Description of Preferred Embodiments in the specification, the claimed invention relates to recording and managing activities conducted by humans in the real world (actual space).

In contrast, neither Toomey nor Hamada teaches or suggests that objects in the work space include a person in a non-simulated real space. As discussed at length in Applicant's previous responses, Toomey is directed toward a *virtual space*, and Hamada simply teaches that displayed animation can be substituted for a video image, recorded sound, or other combination *with animation*. Thus, the instant application would not have been obvious over Toomey in view of Hamada, at least because the combination of Toomey and Hamada would not have obtained the claimed features, i.e., that the objects include a person in a non-simulated real space.

Applicants further note that, as the Advisory Action indicates that the amendments included in the Amendment After Final Rejection filed on May 23 have been entered, Applicants reassert the arguments in the Amendment After Final Rejection in response to this rejection.

For at least the foregoing reasons, instant independent claims 1-2, 11 and 13-21, as amended, and all claims depending therefrom, would not have been obvious over Toomey in view of Hamada. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are earnestly solicited.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-21 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Ryan C. Cady  
Registration No. 56,762

JAO:RCC/amw

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 22, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--